



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/659,881	09/11/2003	Yocel Wazana	28179-7	5001

33417            7590            08/01/2007  
LEWIS, BRISBOIS, BISGAARD & SMITH LLP  
221 NORTH FIGUEROA STREET  
SUITE 1200  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012

EXAMINER
----------

ELVE, MARIA ALEXANDRA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1725

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

08/01/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/659,881	WAZANA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	M. Alexandra Elve	1725	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 July 2007.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 6-11 and 14-18 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 6-11 and 14-18 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 11 September 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/18/07</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
|  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Affidavit/Declaration***

Applicant has not identified the type of declarations and hence the declarations are deemed non-responsive.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

Claims 6 & 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant has used computer programming and computer instructions; these are non-statutory.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Araki (USPN 6,223,010).

Art Unit: 1725

Araki discloses a resin cartridge, which is disassembled.

Applicant's claim recitations regarding the method of forming a product, relate only to the method of producing the claimed product, which does not impart patentability to the product claims. Note that determination of patentability is based on the product itself, In re Brown 173 USPQ 685, 688 and In re Fessmann 180 USPQ 324, and the patentability of a product does not depend its method of production, In re Pilkington 162 USPQ 145, 147; see also In re Thorpe 227 USPQ 964 (CAFC 1985). Note that it is Applicant's burden to prove that an unobvious difference exists, In re Marosi 218 USPQ 289, 292-293 (CAFC 1983), and Applicant must show that different methods of manufacture produce articles having inherently different characteristics, *Ex parte Skinner* 2 USPQ 2d 1788.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Baley (USPN 5,676,794).

Baley discloses a reconditioned printer cartridge.

Applicant's claim recitations regarding the method of forming a product, relate only to the method of producing the claimed product, which does not impart patentability to the product claims. Note that determination of patentability is based on the product itself, In re Brown 173 USPQ 685, 688 and In re Fessmann 180 USPQ 324, and the patentability of a product does not depend its method of production, In re Pilkington 162 USPQ 145, 147; see also In re Thorpe 227 USPQ 964 (CAFC 1985). Note that it is Applicant's burden to prove that an unobvious difference exists, In re Marosi 218 USPQ

Art Unit: 1725

289, 292-293 (CAFC 1983), and Applicant must show that different methods of manufacture produce articles having inherently different characteristics, *Ex parte Skinner* 2 USPQ 2d 1788.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6 & 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Araki (USPN 6,223,010) in view of Basista et al. (USPN 6,609,044) and Piccioli et al. (USPN 4,549,066).

Araki discloses a resin product with the method and apparatus used for disassemble. The cartridge is cut with a laser.

Araki does not teach the use of a computer or a gimbal (that rotation of the part).

Basista et al. discloses the use of a computer and an associated program for laser cutting.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a computer and cutting program as taught by Basista et al. in the Araki system because it would ensure cutting accuracy and decrease processing time.

The provision of mechanical or automated means to replace a manual activity was held to have been obvious. In re Venner 120 USPQ 192.

Piccioli et al. discloses the cutting of a molded polyester resin product using a laser. The polyester resin product is rotated while the laser cuts the excess product off.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a rotation device, as taught by Piccioli et al. in the Araki system because of the enhanced ease of product handling during the disassembly process.

With respect to applicant's predetermined laser power and speed these are design choices, dependent on the material chosen. The types of materials are a choice in design and substitution of known equivalent structures may be made. In re Kuhle 188 USPQ (CCPA 1975), In re Ruff 118 USPQ 343 (CCPA 1958).

Claims 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baley (USPN 5,676,794) in view of Araki.

Baley discloses a reconditioned printer cartridge. The 23 and 25 show the outer edges, which are connected to the top portion of the remanufactured cartridge. Baley discloses the cutting of a toner cartridge for remanufacturing. The figures show that the disassembly is around the rectangular plate that is essentially a circuitous route. The cartridge is moved along a track. Cutting is along the outer edges to a depth of about 3/16 of an inch.

Cutting with a laser is not taught.

Art Unit: 1725

Araki discloses a resin product with the method and apparatus used for disassemble. The cartridge is cut with a laser.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a laser as taught by Araki because it is a functional equivalent of a cutting knife and substations are known.

Claims 10 –11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baley and Araki, as stated above and further in view of Koike et al. ((USPN 6,864,294).

Araki does not teach the type of resin material used.

Koike et al. discloses the recycling of a resin product. The prime example is a thermoplastic ink jet cartridge. The recycled material is typically a thermoplastic ABS resin (acrylonitrile butadiene styrene resin), which is a so-called styrene based polymer.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use ABS, as taught by Koike et al. in the Baley and Araki system because this is merely a type of resinous material that is traditionally used in cartridges.

The prior art discloses a product substantially similar to a claimed product, differing only in the manner by which it is produced. It has been held that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have considered the claimed product because of the similarities in appearance, properties and function. The burden falls to the applicant to show that any process steps associated with the claimed product results in a materially different product from those of the prior art, because there is nothing in the record before the examiner to reasonably conclude that applicant's

Art Unit: 1725

product differs in kind from those obtained by the references. See *In re Brown* 173 USPQ 685 and *In re Fessman* 180 USPQ 324.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 7/18/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Araki teaches away from instant claims because the after the Araki process no cartridge remains. The examiner respectfully notes that the Araki reference was used to teach disassembly of the cartridge. Furthermore, applicant does not specifically state reassembly or remanufacturing in the claims. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., remanufacture) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Applicant argues that Basista et al. is not relevant to the field of the present invention and that Basista is not intended to cut cartridges. The examiner respectfully notes that Basista is directed to laser cutting of sheet materials.

In response to applicant's argument that Basista is nonanalogous art, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Basista is directed to general laser cutting of sheet materials that include metals and polymeric materials.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Applicant argues that Piccioli is directed to the blow molding of a polyester container and not remanufacturing of a cartridge. The examiner respectfully notes that applicant does not specifically state reassembly or remanufacturing in the claims. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., remanufacture) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Applicant argues that Piccioli is not relevant art and that Piccioli does not disclose interface joining sections.

In response to applicant's argument that Piccioli is nonanalogous art, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Piccioli is directed to laser working of polymeric materials, much the same as cartridge materials.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Applicant states that the Baley is different than the Lewis process. The examiner respectfully notes that a Lewis reference was not used in rejecting applicant's claims.

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

Art Unit: 1725

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to M. Alexandra Elve whose telephone number is 571-272-1173. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30-3:00 Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jonathan Johnson can be reached on 571-272-1177. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1725

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

July 30, 2007.

/M. Alexandra Elve/  
M. Alexandra Elve  
Primary Examiner 1725